

LEVEL II

RESEARCH NOTE 79-13

①

ANALYSIS OF RACE RELATIONS/EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TRAINING IN KOREA



by

William S. Edmonds
Peter G. Nordlie

Human Sciences Research, Inc.

AD A069244

DDC FILE COPY

Contract No. DAHC 19-76-C-0015
James A. Thomas
ARI Field Unit
Presidio of Monterey, CA

November 1977



U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE
for the BEHAVIORAL and SOCIAL SCIENCES
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, Virginia 22333

DDC
RECEIVED
JUN 1 1979
D

79 05 25 005

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Research Note 79-13	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER (9)
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) ANALYSIS OF RACE RELATIONS/EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TRAINING IN KOREA	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final Report. January 1976-December 1977	
7. AUTHOR(S) William S. Edmonds Peter G. Nordlie	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(S) DAHC 19-76-C-0015	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Human Sciences Research, Inc. 7710 Old Springhouse Road McLean, Virginia 22101	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT PROJECT TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 2Q263744A769	11. REPORT DATE November 1977
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, Virginia 22333	12. NUMBER OF PAGES 54 + X	13. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) ARI Field Unit-Monterey Box 5787 Presidio of Monterey, California 93940	14. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	15. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. (18) ARI (19) RN-79-13
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES This is the fourth in a series of eight reports under contract No. DAHC 19-76-C-0015, monitored by James Thomas, ARI Field Unit, Presidio of Monterey California.		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Race Relations Racial Climate Equal Opportunity Racial Attitudes Training Programs Korea Training Evaluation		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Human Sciences Research, Inc., conducted an analysis and assessment of the Army unit training program in RR/EO. Data collected in an Army-wide survey are being reported in three reports—one for CONUS, one for Korea, and one for USAREUR. This report is for Korea. ↓-Continued over		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

173 250

20. Abstract (Continued)

In general it was found that the racial climate is more negative in Korea than in CONUS. Blacks perceived more discrimination occurring in Korea and whites perceived more "reverse discrimination" compared with CONUS:

Required RR/EO seminars appear to be held somewhat less frequently than in CONUS. Overall conduct of seminars closely resembles that of CONUS. As in CONUS, the priority of the program appeared to be quite low.

The credibility of RR/EO programs in Korea appears to be low, the majority of personnel perceiving that they are "just for show." The results overall suggest that racial tensions are high in Korea and that the RR/EO unit training is not effectively achieving program objectives.

ACCESSION TO	
OTIS	White Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ODS	Diff Section <input type="checkbox"/>
UNANNOUNCED	<input type="checkbox"/>
JUSTIFICATION	
BY	
DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES	
ONE	AVAIL. ONE/OF SPECIAL
A	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Study Title: Analysis of Race Relations/Equal Opportunity Training in Korea

Authors: William S. Edmonds and Peter G. Nordlie
Human Sciences Research, Inc.

Sponsor: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

Contract Number: DAHC 19-76-C-0015

**Contracting Officer's
Technical Representative:** Dr. James A. Thomas

This is one in a series of reports from an on-going study of Army race relations and equal opportunity training. The scope of this particular report is limited to Korea. The total set of reports prepared on this project is listed at the end of this summary.

The overall purpose of the study is to describe how the RR/EO unit training program is being implemented at local levels in the field and to assess, to the extent possible, the effectiveness of that training. The findings in this report are from data collected in Korea in July and October of 1976. To provide a comparative context, the findings from Korea are compared with those obtained in CONUS. The data reported comes primarily from a survey questionnaire administered to a 40 percent random sample of 12 companies selected from a division-sized unit in Korea.¹

The report is organized around three major topics: (1) the racial climate in Korea; (2) conduct of unit RR/EO seminars in Korea; and (3) current attitudes toward the RR/EO program in general and the racial awareness program in particular.

Racial Climate in Korea

The racial climate is more negative and blacks and whites are farther apart on most issues in Korea than in CONUS. The majority of both blacks and whites believe that race relations are fair to poor and that they have not changed for the better in the past year. As in CONUS, the situation might be described as one of "racial *détente*" in that there is no

¹ Subsequent reference to Korea refers only to this division-sized unit, since use of the term "division-sized unit" throughout the report is awkward. There is no intent to generalize these findings to EUSA as a whole.

(1) 79 05 05 005

reported increase in overt racial conflict. However, the data suggest that the levels of inter-racial tension in Korea are high.

Compared to CONUS, in Korea blacks perceived more discrimination against non-whites and whites perceived more "reverse racism." The reported levels of voluntary racial separation were higher and there was less cross-racial helping behavior. About a fourth of the whites and two-fifths of the blacks had the perception that the level of racial tension in their units may have affected their units' ability to function effectively.

Conduct of RR/EO Unit Training

The required RR/EO seminars appear to be held somewhat less frequently than in CONUS. They are generally led by a member of the chain of command and are held during prime training time. They appear to be held in groups averaging about 50. The topics tend to emphasize the dynamics of individual racism and the formal RR/EO programs of the Army. The conduct of unit RR/EO seminars closely resemble the conduct of seminars in CONUS. As in CONUS, the priority of the RR/EO seminars appeared to be quite low. It appears that more soldiers attend seminars in Korea, though they are held less frequently.

Current Attitudes toward the RR/EO Program

The credibility of RR/EO programs in Korea is quite low. The majority perception is that the programs are "just for show." Despite this view, both whites and blacks said they thought RR/EO training was important. They are not so sure, however, of the commitment of the chain of command to the program. In terms of achieving its objectives, the training program appeared to be much more successful with blacks than with whites. The white population is evenly divided between those who believe that RR/EO training is effective in helping to reduce racial tensions, and those who believe it is not. Both groups see the program as being more helpful to the other. The preponderance of blacks see the training as at least somewhat effective in reducing racial tensions in the Army.

Overall, the RR/EO programs in Korea appear less credible and somewhat less effective in achieving their objectives than was the case in CONUS. The survey results suggest that racial tensions are higher among Army personnel in Korea than in CONUS. They also suggest that existing RR/EO unit training is not adequately or effectively helping to reduce that tension.

Other reports under this contract are:

An Analysis of the Unit Race Relations Training Program in the U.S. Army (1976).

Analysis of Experimental Race Relations/Equal Opportunity Training (1977)

Analysis of Race Relations/Equal Opportunity Training in USAREUR (1978)

Analysis of Individual Race Relations and Equal Opportunity Training in Army Schools (1977).

Analysis and Assessment of the Army Race Relations and Equal Opportunity Training Programs—Summary Report of Conclusions and Recommendations (1978).

An Analysis of the Training of Army Personnel at the Defense Race Relations Institute (1977).

The Development of a Management Tool to Assess Institutional Discrimination at Division, Brigade, and Battalion Levels (1977).

Commanders' Handbook for Assessing Institutional Discrimination in Their Units (1977).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iii
I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW	3
Background	3
Relationship of Korea to the Total Study	4
Objectives	5
Research Approach	5
Research Design	6
The Sample	7
II. THE RACIAL CLIMATE IN KOREA	9
Racial Attitudes and Perceptions	9
Promotions	12
Punishment	13
Work Assignments	13
Training Opportunities	14
Perceptions of Discrimination against Whites	15
Behavioral Aspects of Racial Climate	17
Voluntary Racial Separation	17
Race-Related Verbal Behaviors	19
Racial Conflict	21
Positive Interracial Interaction	23
Quality of Race Relations in Korea	24
Summary and Conclusions about the Racial Climate	27
III. THE CONDUCT OF UNIT RR/EO SEMINARS IN KOREA	29
Frequency of Training	30
Instructors	32
Other Seminar Characteristics	33
Summary	33

IV.	CURRENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE RR/EO PROGRAM	35
	Attitudes about the RR/EO Program	35
	Attitudes and Perceptions about RR/EO Training	39
	Summary	43
V.	THE SECOND SURVEY THREE MONTHS LATER	45
VI.	SUMMARY	47
	Unit RR/EO Seminars	48
	Conclusions and Comments	49
	APPENDIX: CHI-SQUARE TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES IN BLACK-WHITE AND KOREA- CONUS RESPONSE PATTERNS	51

LIST OF TABLES

1	Racial Distribution of the Sample	7
2	Perceptions of Discrimination against Non-Whites	10
3	Perceptions of Equality of Treatment	11
4	Perceptions of What It Takes to Make the Grade in the Army	11
5	Perceptions of Promotion Opportunities	12
6	Perceptions of Punishment for Breaking Rules	13
7	Perceptions of Assignment to Work Details	14
8	Perceptions of Opportunities for Training	14
9	Feelings of Reverse Racism	15
10	Perceptions of the Adverse Effect of the Army's RR/EO Program on Whites	16
11	Perceptions of What is Happening to the Rights of White Middle-Class Americans	16
12	Perceptions of Discrimination against Whites	17
13	Perceptions of On-Duty Voluntary Separations	18
14	Perceptions of Off-Duty Voluntary Separations	18
15	Use of Racial Slurs by Whites	19
16	Use of Racial Slurs by Blacks	20
17	Racist Joke Telling	21
18	Interracial Harassment	22
19	Perceptions of Interracial Conflict	23
20	Helping Behavior	23
21	Racial Interaction	24
22	Perceived Quality of Race Relations	24
23	Perceived Changes in Quality of Race Relations	25
24	Perception of Racial Tension in the Unit	25

25	Changes in Perceptions of Army Race Relations	26
26	Changes in Perceptions of the Trend in Race Relations	26
27	Frequency with Which RR/EO Seminars are Held (Blacks and Whites Combined)	30
28	Time Since Attending Last Seminar (Blacks and Whites Combined)	30
29	Seminar Topics	32
30	Instructors (Black and White Responses Combined)	33
31	Perceptions of the Army's Commitment to the Principle of Equal Opportunity	35
32	Perceived Desire for Racial Equality by Whites	36
33	Perception of Enforcement of RR/EO Policies	36
34	Perceptions of Attitudes of Commanders	37
35	Seriousness of the RR/EO Program	38
36	Perceptions of the Necessity of the Army's RR/EO Programs	38
37	Perceptions of Potential Benefits of the RR/EO Program	39
38	Perceptions of Importance of RR/EO Training	40
39	Perception of RR/EO Seminars' Effect on Increasing Interest in Improving Race Relations	41
40	Perceptions of the Effect of Unit RR/EO Seminars in Improving Race Relations	41
41	Perceptions of RR/EO Seminars' Effectiveness in Improving Unit Interracial Communications	42
42	Effectiveness of Training in Reducing Racial Tensions	42
43	Perceptions of the Usefulness of Race Relations Seminars	43

**ANALYSIS OF THE
RACE RELATIONS/EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TRAINING
IN KOREA**

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Background

The development and implementation of race relations and equal opportunity programs within the Army during the late sixties and early seventies constitutes one of the most massive change efforts of its type ever undertaken by any large organization. The creation of training programs, the development of race relations/equal opportunity (RR/EO) staffs, the formulation and enforcement of new policies, all required a tremendous investment of time and effort. At their very outset, the Army's race relations training programs were initiated quickly to meet urgent needs; there was little precedent on which to build and no experience with such training in the military. Methods were chosen and content formulated on the basis of limited experience, trial and error, and the best judgments of relatively few people.

The original Army-wide race relations and equal opportunity training program (RAP I) was a mandatory 18-hour block of instruction which was generally taught by graduates of the Defense Race Relations Institute (DRRI) at the post or community. By early 1974, that program was modified by a revised AR 600-42 to create RAP II which placed the primary responsibility for conducting RR/EO training on the chain of command and required seminars to be conducted within units in platoon-sized groups on a monthly basis. The basic RR/EO policy documents were revised again in September 1977.

The original training program was created and most of the subsequent changes in the program have been made with little input from evaluation research designed to measure the effectiveness of the training being given. A major impetus for the present research study is to help remedy that deficiency and begin to provide objective data on what impact the training is having. A further impetus is the desire to determine how, in fact, the present

policy is actually being implemented in the field. These two needs for information provide the twin thrusts behind the present study—i.e., program analysis and impact assessment.

Relationship of Korea to the Total Study

In the unit training program analysis and assessment part of the total study, data were collected from locations in CONUS, USAREUR, and Korea. For a number of reasons, including the fact that the overall situation appeared quite different in the three locations and that it proved necessary to utilize somewhat different research designs in the three locations, it was decided to prepare separate reports on the three locations. The present report of the Korea part of the study is one in a series of reports on the total study. There are five reports which concern some aspect of the unit RR/EO training. These are:

*An Analysis of the Unit Race Relations Training Program
in the U.S. Army.*

*Analysis of Race Relations/Equal Opportunity Training in
Korea.*

*Analysis of Race Relations/Equal Opportunity Training in
USAREUR.*

*Analysis of Experimental Race Relations/Equal Opportunity
Training.*

*Analysis and Assessment of the Army Race Relations and
Equal Opportunity Training Programs: Summary Report
of Conclusions and Recommendations.*

In addition, three other reports have been prepared on other aspects of the total project. These are:

*An Analysis of the Training of Army Personnel at the
Defense Race Relations Institute.*

*Analysis of Individual Race Relations and Equal Opportunity
Training in Army Schools.*

*Commanders' Handbook for Assessing Institutional
Discrimination in Their Units.*

In this report the data from Korea are analyzed and, where appropriate, compared with similar data collected in CONUS.

Objectives

The objectives of this part of the study are to:

- describe how the unit training program is being implemented at the local level in Korea; and
- assess what impact the unit training program is having.

The first objective involves a comparison between how the unit training program was *intended* to function with how it was *actually* functioning at those sites visited. In other words, how was the policy being translated into reality at the company level?

The second objective focused on measuring the impact of RR/EO training. The intent was to measure changes in knowledge, attitudes, perceptions, and behavior which can be attributed to the RR/EO training experience. The purpose was to determine what impact RR/EO training is having, what aspects of variations appear most effective. In short, the assessment objective was to determine the extent to which RR/EO training is achieving its objectives.

Research Approach

The research approach to the overall study was described in detail in the CONUS report and the reader is referred to that report for a detailed description.¹

The original design envisioned a Time 1 measurement in a sample of companies in the Army and a Time 2 measurement several months later during which period training was presumed to occur. As a consequence of the Time 1 data collection in CONUS, it became evident that the amount of training actually occurring was insufficient for the

¹Robert L. Hiatt and Peter G. Nordlie, *An Analysis of the Unit Race Relations Training Program in the U.S. Army* (McLean, Va.: Human Sciences Research, Inc., 1976).

original design to make any sense and the Time 2 data collection was cancelled in CONUS accordingly. Whereas most units did provide some sort of training experience to satisfy regulations, the content relevant to race relations was in many cases merely the title of the course. The general lack of race-related content meant that a Time 2 measurement would only over-document the obvious outcome of little or no change with respect to training objectives.

In USAREUR, the original Time 1/Time 2 data collection design was retained since there appeared to be sufficient training being done to justify it and because a new variation in the program was being initiated at the time of the Time 1 data collection visits (October 1976). In Korea, the original Time 1/Time 2 data collection was also retained primarily because of the practical consideration that by the time it became evident that a change in design would be appropriate, it was too late to modify the design. For Korea, therefore, Time 1/Time 2 data were collected in July and October of 1976.

Research Design

A division-sized unit was selected for study. The brigade-sized units within that unit were identified and a systematic sample of 12 companies were selected subject to the following groundrules.

Company-sized units were listed by major organizational grouping (brigade). Companies were then selected at random within each brigade. Sampling was performed in such a way as to insure that one-fourth of the total companies selected were headquarters units. Thus, if the first company selected was a headquarters unit, the next three units were not allowed to be headquarters companies.

This procedure was followed to ensure appropriate representation of different kinds of companies. For each company selected, about a 40 percent sample of personnel were randomly selected from total rosters.

The data collection instrument obtained information in the following areas: background information on each respondent; measures of attitudes and perceptions in

race-related areas; measures of race-related behaviors; and knowledge measures.² The surveys were administered in group settings with personnel assured of anonymity and encouraged to give complete and frank answers. Completed questionnaires were returned to HSR's home offices, keypunched, data files established and edited, and data analyzed. The second survey was administered by Army Research Institute personnel in Korea according to instructions provided by HSR.

With this design, it was possible to compare the findings for the sample of personnel in Korea with findings from personnel in CONUS units. It was also possible to determine whether changes occurred between the first and second administrations. Since there was no control group, however, it was not appropriate to attribute changes directly to the race relations program.

The Sample

The samples obtained in Korea on the first and second survey are shown in Table 1. Although the number of whites and others were slightly smaller in the second survey than in the first, there were no differences between the survey samples with respect to age, sex, and rank. The racial distribution of the initial survey is not significantly different from the CONUS sample.

Table 1
Racial Distribution of the Sample

	First Survey		Second Survey	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Korea				
Black	88	28	88	36
White	193	62	137	55
Other	30	10	21	9
CONUS			[No second survey in CONUS.]	
Black	948	24		
White	2,785	69		
Other	296	7		

²For a detailed discussion and description of the instrument, see the Technical Appendices to *An Analysis of the Unit Race Relations Training Program in the U.S. Army*, Robert L. Hiatt, Marcia A. Gilbert, Dale K. Brown (McLean, Va.: Human Sciences Research, Inc., December 1976).

Data in this report were analyzed and are presented by race. Because personnel who identified themselves as neither white nor black were not from any single, homogeneous ethnic group in numbers sufficiently large to be meaningful in the analysis, their responses were excluded from any further investigation in this report, although where the samples were larger in CONUS, the non-black minority responses were reported separately.

To facilitate reading the tables, the responses are shown in percentages reported in round numbers. The white and black N's for each question are also shown in each table so that the N's of individual responses can be reconstructed if there were reason for doing so. Whenever the same question was asked in CONUS as was asked in Korea, the data from CONUS are also shown in order to provide a comparison. The significance of the differences between the black, white, Korea, and CONUS response patterns to individual questions were tested by chi-square. The chi-square results and significance levels are tabled and presented in the Appendix.

CHAPTER II

THE RACIAL CLIMATE IN KOREA

The description of racial climate is based on responses to questions concerning: perceptions of and attitudes toward race relations and equal opportunity in the Army; reports of respondents' own behavior and of the behavior of others in their companies; and knowledge about RR/EO matters.

In examining racial climate in Korea, it must be remembered that Army life in Korea is characterized by isolation and separation from family. Most service personnel are not accompanied by their families. The civilian population is of a different race and culture and speaks a language different from that of service personnel. These factors serve to limit the opportunity for positive off-duty cross-cultural exchange for most personnel. Also, most soldiers live on post in government quarters. Consequently, for most soldiers, the physical environment both on and off duty is the same.

Overall, the racial climate in Korea appeared more negative than in CONUS. More blacks saw discrimination against blacks and more whites expressed feelings of "reverse discrimination." In general, there appeared to be greater racial polarization in Korea than in CONUS in a number of areas.

Racial Attitudes and Perceptions

One primary goal of the Army's RR/EO program is to insure that all Army personnel are treated equally, without regard to race. An important aspect of the racial climate, then, would have to do with Army members' perceptions concerning equal treatment. While perceptions of the equality of treatment may not perfectly correlate with the objective reality of treatment, prior research suggests that behavior is more related to how people perceive reality than the objective characteristics of that reality. Thus, perceptions of unequal treatment may lead to racial tension even if an objective assessment would demonstrate no actual inequality. A basic and critical finding of this study is that most people

do perceive differences in the treatment received by persons of different races in the Army.

One piece of evidence is in Table 2 where blacks and whites in CONUS and Korea are compared on their mean scores on a scale of perceived discrimination against non-whites. This scale consisted of 17 items the responses to which could be scored and summed to produce a single score.³ It is clear in Table 2 that there are large differences between blacks and whites in perceived discrimination against non-whites. While there were no significant differences between whites in Korea and CONUS in these perceptions, the scores of blacks in Korea were significantly lower than blacks in CONUS meaning blacks saw more discrimination in Korea than blacks did in CONUS.

Table 2

Perceptions of Discrimination against Non-Whites

*(The lower the score, the greater the perception of discrimination.
Range of possible scores is 16 to 80.)*

	Korea			CONUS		
	<u>N</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>s</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>s</u>
Blacks	86	38.07	10.75	932	40.60	11.01
Whites	189	63.02	7.61	2,755	62.60	8.14
<i>Black/white differences in Korea</i>				<i>z = -19.4</i>	<i>p < .01</i>	
<i>Black differences Korea/CONUS</i>				<i>z = -2.08</i>	<i>p < .05</i>	
<i>White difference Korea/CONUS</i>				<i>z = .80</i>	<i>ns</i>	

Table 3 shows that fewer than half of those surveyed believe that whites and non-whites are treated exactly the same. Whites tend to split between the belief that everybody is treated the same and that non-whites are treated better than whites. Blacks, for the most part believe that non-whites are treated worse than whites. In comparison with CONUS,

³See Robert L. Hiatt, Marcia A. Gilbert, Dale K. Brown, *An Analysis of the Unit Race Relations Training Program in the U.S. Army—Technical Appendices* (McLean, Va.: Human Sciences Research, Inc., 1976), for a discussion of the factor analytic procedures used to derive the scales.

more blacks perceive that non-whites are treated worse and more whites perceive that non-whites are treated better. Thus, the divergent perceptions of blacks and whites are even more divergent in Korea than in CONUS.

Table 3
Perceptions of Equality of Treatment

Question: *Which of the following statements is closest to your opinion?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 182)	% Blacks (N = 80)	% Whites (N = 2,705)	% Blacks (N = 109)	
53	4	45	8	In general, non-whites are treated better than whites in the Army.
40	24	48	26	In general, non-whites are treated exactly the same as whites in the Army.
7	72	7	66	In general, non-whites are treated worse than whites in the Army.

Responses to a related question are shown in Table 4 where over 60 percent of blacks believe that blacks in the Army must do more than the average white to make the grade, while 85 percent of whites disagreed with that view. The Korea response pattern is quite similar to that obtained in CONUS.

Table 4
Perceptions of What It Takes to Make the Grade in the Army

Statement: *A black in the Army must do more than the average white to make the grade.*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 161)	% Blacks (N = 76)	% Whites (N = 2,353)	% Blacks (N = 788)	
4	64	6	63	Strongly Agree/Agree
11	16	11	19	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
85	20	83	18	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Promotions

It is of interest to note that both whites and blacks substantially agree that whites and non-whites are *equally qualified* for promotion. The difference occurs when the question is asked in terms of who has the best chance of actually being promoted. Here, the sharp differences shown in Table 5 occur. The majority of whites still believe that chances are equal for all races. For blacks, however, while 76 percent believed all races were qualified, only 23 percent believed all races had equal chances. Where the Korea responses differ from the CONUS responses, the differences tend to accentuate the black-white differences in Korea.

Table 5
Perceptions of Promotion Opportunities

Question: *As a general rule, which racial group is best qualified for promotion to higher enlisted grades in the Army?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 190)	% Blacks (N = 85)	% Whites (N = 2,730)	% Blacks (N = 922)	
67	76	72	74	On the average, soldiers of all races are qualified.
31	12	26	19	On the average, white soldiers are best qualified.
2	12	2	7	On the average, non-white soldiers are best qualified.

Question: *As a general rule, which racial group has the best chance for promotion to higher enlisted grades?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 190)	% Blacks (N = 84)	% Whites (N = 2,721)	% Blacks (N = 924)	
65	23	67	29	Chances are equal for all races.
9	73	9	67	Whites have the best chance.
22	2	19	2	Blacks have the best chance.
4	2	4	2	Other minorities have the best chance.

Punishment

Clearcut opposing opinions exist with respect to who gets away with breaking rules. Blacks say whites get away with it (60%) whereas 90 percent of whites disagree (Table 6). When the question is reversed and one asks if non-whites get away with breaking rules that whites are punished for, the pattern, not unsurprisingly, reverses. To the extent there is a difference between Korea and CONUS, it is in the direction of greater black-white differences in Korea.

Table 6
Perceptions of Punishment for Breaking Rules

Statement: *In my unit, whites get away with breaking rules that non-whites are punished for.*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 160)	% Blacks (N = 75)	% Whites (N = 2,344)	% Blacks (N = 780)	
11	60	3	47	Strongly Agree/Agree
8	20	7	23	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
91	20	90	30	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Statement: *In my unit, non-whites get away with breaking rules that whites are punished for.*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 161)	% Blacks (N = 76)	% Whites (N = 2,347)	% Blacks (N = 781)	
45	12	48	7	Strongly Agree/Agree
21	7	18	11	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
34	81	34	82	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Work Assignments

The same pattern is evident in the perceptions of work assignments (Table 7). Blacks believe non-whites get more than their share of dirty details and whites, in even

larger proportions, believe they do not. The white responses in Korea and CONUS are similar but, once again, blacks differ even slightly more from whites in Korea than they do in CONUS.

Table 7
Perceptions of Assignment to Work Details

Statement: *Non-whites get more than their share of dirty details.*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 161)	% Blacks (N = 71)	% Whites (N = 2,323)	% Blacks (N = 773)	
7	52	7	49	Strongly Agree/Agree
17	21	15	23	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
76	27	78	28	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Training Opportunities

A similar pattern exists in the perceptions of opportunities for training. Blacks believe that whites have a better chance to get the best training opportunities. Whites, as with other similar questions, have a sharply opposing view.

Table 8
Perceptions of Opportunities for Training

Statement: *Whites have a better chance than non-whites to get the best training opportunities*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 161)	% Blacks (N = 76)	% Whites (N = 2,351)	% Blacks (N = 786)	
4	55	6	51	Strongly Agree/Agree
18	29	17	24	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
78	16	77	25	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Perceptions of Discrimination against Whites

Surveys since 1972 have shown that the proportion of whites who perceive that whites are the victims of "reverse discrimination" has been increasing. A number of questions relative to this perception were asked in the present survey. One group of such questions were developed and scored as a scale which was called "Feelings of Reverse Racism."⁴

In Table 9, the scores on the seven-item "reverse racism" scale for CONUS and Korea are shown. Just as in Table 2, where blacks perceived more discrimination against non-whites in Korea, so too in Table 9, whites in Korea express higher feelings of reverse racism than whites did in CONUS.

Table 9

Feelings of Reverse Racism

(The lower the score, the higher the feelings of reverse racism.
Range of possible scores is 8 to 40.)

	Korea			CONUS		
	<u>N</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>s</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>\bar{X}</u>	<u>s</u>
Blacks	85	29.66	4.42	932	29.59	4.42
Whites	189	21.82	5.93	2,755	23.05	5.81

Black/white difference in Korea	$z = -13.59$	$p < .01$
Black difference Korea/Conus	$z = .28$	ns
White difference Korea/CONUS	$z = -2.76$	$p < .01$

Three questions in particular dealt with different aspects of the perceptions of discrimination against whites. Table 10 shows responses to a question about whether the Army's RR/EO program helps minorities at the expense of whites. Substantially more whites than blacks believed that to be true in both CONUS and Korea.

⁴See Robert L. Hiatt, Marcia A. Gilbert, Dale K. Brown, *Ibid.*

Table 10
Perceptions of the Adverse Effect of the Army's
RR/EO Program on Whites

Statement: *The Army's RR/EO program helps minorities get ahead at the expense of whites.*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 161)	% Blacks (N = 76)	% Whites (N = 2,351)	% Blacks (N = 798)	
34	9	28	7	Strongly Agree/Agree
32	28	33	23	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
35	63	39	70	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

In Table 11 we see that more than a third of the whites believe they are giving up too many of their rights for the rights of others, although the vast majority of blacks disagree with this view.

Table 11
Perceptions of What is Happening to the Rights of
White Middle-Class Americans

Statement: *White middle-class Americans are giving up too many of their own rights for the rights of others.*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 160)	% Blacks (N = 76)	% Whites (N = 2,341)	% Blacks (N = 781)	
36	67	38	11	Strongly Agree/Agree
39	25	31	27	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
25	68	31	63	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

In Table 12, nearly half of the whites believe that there was racial discrimination against whites on their post. There is little difference between Korea and CONUS on this question but it is interesting to note that more than 50 percent of blacks did not agree with the statement.

Table 12
Perceptions of Discrimination against Whites*

Statement: *There was racial discrimination against whites on my post.*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 159)	% Blacks (N = 75)	% Whites (N = 2,350)	% Blacks (N = 785)	
47	23	37	23	Strongly Agree/Agree
29	25	29	30	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
24	52	34	47	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

It is fairly clear that whites are not highly favorable toward the RR/EO program nor are they even neutral. A substantial proportion of whites believe the RR/EO program works to their disadvantage.

Behavioral Aspects of Racial Climate

In the analysis so far, it appears that racial tensions in Korea may be more severe than in CONUS. One issue that can be addressed is the extent to which these tensions are manifested in behavior.

Voluntary Racial Separation

Whites and blacks report high levels of voluntary racial separations both on and off duty. As Tables 13 and 14 indicate, more than half of all respondents felt that voluntary racial separation occurred often or very often. For the most part, there were no differences between CONUS and Korea. The single exception is that whites in Korea reported less separation by whites on the job.

Table 13

Perceptions of On-Duty Voluntary Separations

Question: *How often did non-whites or minority personnel in your company or work unit stick together while on the job?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 191)	% Blacks (N = 87)	% Whites (N = 2,734)	% Blacks (N = 924)	
47	52	46	42	Very Often/Often
32	22	30	31	Sometimes
21	26	24	27	Seldom/Never

Question: *How often did white personnel in your company or work unit stick together while on the job?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 191)	% Blacks (N = 87)	% Whites (N = 2,727)	% Blacks (N = 928)	
30	45	35	47	Very Often/Often
34	27	30	27	Sometimes
37	27	35	25	Seldom/Never

Table 14

Perceptions of Off-Duty Voluntary Separations

Question: *How often did non-whites or minority personnel in your company spend time with just non-whites during off-duty hours?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 191)	% Blacks (N = 85)	% Whites (N = 2,716)	% Blacks (N = 918)	
53	50	54	50	Very Often/Often
28	30	27	28	Sometimes
19	20	19	22	Seldom/Never

Question: *How often did whites in your company spend time with just whites during off-duty hours?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 192)	% Blacks (N = 88)	% Whites (N = 2,732)	% Blacks (N = 922)	
58	56	62	60	Very Often/Often
29	24	28	25	Sometimes
13	21	10	15	Seldom/Never

Race-Related Verbal Behaviors

The use of derogatory statements, racial epithets, and slurs is commonly thought to be closely associated with high racial tension levels and, therefore, are indicators of poor race relations. The use of racial slurs by whites against blacks and Orientals is shown in Table 15. In Table 16 is the comparable data for blacks.

Table 15

Use of Racial Slurs by Whites

Question: *How often did white personnel in your company or work unit refer to blacks as "nigger," "coon," etc.?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 191)	% Blacks (N = 85)	% Whites (N = 2,732)	% Blacks (N = 919)	
14	24	25	25	Very Often/Often
26	26	25	24	Sometimes
60	50	50	51	Seldom/Never

Question: *How often did white personnel in your company or work unit refer to Orientals and people of Asian heritage as "slopes," "gooks," etc.?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 190)	% Blacks (N = 86)	% Whites (N = 2,735)	% Blacks (N = 923)	
24	32	19	22	Very Often/Often
29	25	24	27	Sometimes
47	43	57	51	Seldom/Never

In describing slurs against blacks by whites, blacks give about the same response pattern in Korea as they did in CONUS. However, whites in Korea report that they hear fewer racial slurs by whites against blacks in Korea than in CONUS (Table 15). Both blacks and whites hear more slurs against Orientals by whites in Korea than were reported in CONUS (Table 15).

Table 16
Use of Racial Slurs by Blacks

Question: *How often did non-whites or minority personnel in your company or work unit refer to whites as "honky," "gringo," etc.?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 189)	% Blacks (N = 86)	% Whites (N = 2,708)	% Blacks (N = 923)	
31	16	31	24	Very Often/Often
32	34	28	33	Sometimes
37	50	41	43	Seldom/Never

Question: *How often did non-white or minority personnel in company or work unit refer to Orientals and people of Asian heritage as "slopes," "gooks," etc.?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 188)	% Blacks (N = 86)	% Whites (N = 2,697)	% Blacks (N = 923)	
36	11	18	10	Very Often/Often
25	31	28	22	Sometimes
39	58	54	68	Seldom/Never

With respect to slurs by blacks against whites, blacks hear them less often in Korea than in CONUS but whites hear almost the same (Table 16). Both whites and blacks hear more slurs by blacks against Orientals in Korea than in CONUS (Table 16).

There is an apparent contradiction between the earlier statement that racial tensions in Korea seem to be higher than in CONUS and the less frequent use of racial slurs. A hypothesis which might be proposed is that, as tensions decrease, people are more likely to use racial slurs in a more friendly, joking way that is acceptable by persons of all races. As tensions increase, however, such terms are taken much more seriously and, therefore, avoided by everybody. One other explanation is that the use of racial epithets and slurs are forbidden by Army policy and in Korea this policy might be rigidly enforced.

On the whole, both blacks and whites report more racial slurs against Orientals by both whites and blacks in Korea than in CONUS (Tables 15 and 16). It is as if the

the high proportion of Orientals in the environment provided some opportunity for displacement for some of what was perhaps black/white antagonism through this verbal behavior. As perceptions of slurs against either whites or blacks went down, the percentage of slurs against Orientals tended to go up.

In a similar view, race is literally no joking matter in Korea. Very few blacks or whites report that members of their own races tell racist jokes often or very often. Whites report racist joke telling occurring more frequently than do blacks, but that percentage is not large. Even more important is the fact that larger proportions of both races in Korea than in CONUS report that racist joke telling occurs seldom or never (see Table 17).

Table 17
Racist Joke Telling

Question: *How often did people of your own race in your company or work unit tell racist jokes about other races?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 189)	% Blacks (N = 85)	% Whites (N = 2,750)	% Blacks (N = 916)	
12	5	20	15	Very Often/Often
41	35	41	35	Sometimes
47	60	39	50	Seldom/Never

Racial Conflict

So far, the reported behavior being examined has not related to actual physical interaction. The last behavior to be considered is that involving actual conflicts between persons of different races. Black soldiers report with moderate frequency that white personnel harass non-whites and keep them away from facilities supposedly open to all soldiers. And whites perceive that non-whites are more likely to keep whites away from public facilities. Blacks and whites in Korea both perceived that this behavior occurred more frequently than did blacks and whites in CONUS (Table 18).

Table 18
Interracial Harassment

Question: *How often did white personnel in your company or work unit get together in certain situations to harass or keep non-whites out of facilities which are supposed to be open to all?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 192)	% Blacks (N = 88)	% Whites (N=2,732)	% Blacks (N = 923)	
6	18	5	12	Very Often/Often
10	18	10	20	Sometimes
84	64	85	68	Seldom/Never

Question: *How often did non-white or minority personnel in your company or work unit get together in certain situations to harass or keep whites out of facilities which are supposed to be open to all?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 187)	% Blacks (N = 87)	% Whites (N=2,719)	% Blacks (N = 908)	
26	14	19	9	Very Often/Often
28	36	25	21	Sometimes
46	51	56	70	Seldom/Never

Actual physical conflict was perceived by both races to occur with a low frequency. Less than 20 percent of both blacks and whites report that actual violence occurs at all, only 5 percent believe that racial conflict occurs often or very often. The responses in CONUS and Korea appear fairly similar (Table 19).

Table 19

Perceptions of Interracial Conflict

Question: *How often did whites and non-whites in your company or work unit form groups and challenge each other to fights?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 189)	% Blacks (N = 85)	% Whites (N = 2,745)	% Blacks (N = 927)	
5	2	4	6	Very Often/Often
14	15	11	13	Sometimes
80	82	85	81	Seldom/Never

Positive Interracial Interaction

Two questions elicited responses about the frequency that whites and blacks help each other and do things together (Tables 20 and 21).

Table 20

Helping Behavior

Question: *How often did whites and non-whites in your company or work unit go out of their way to help each other?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 187)	% Blacks (N = 86)	% Whites (N = 2,740)	% Blacks (N = 915)	
17	12	23	16	Very Often/Often
40	37	40	35	Sometimes
43	51	37	49	Seldom/Never

Table 21

Racial Interactions

Table 21
Racial Interaction

Question: *How often did whites and non-whites in your company or work unit go to post clubs together (Enlisted Club, NCO Club, Officers Club)?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 186)	% Blacks (N = 86)	% Whites (N = 2,729)	% Blacks (N = 917)	
30	23	28	24	Very Often/Often
43	37	42	35	Sometimes
27	40	30	41	Seldom/Never

There was a slight tendency for both whites and blacks in Korea to report less helping behavior than was reported in CONUS and in both locations whites tended to see more helping behavior than did blacks, but these differences were not statistically significant. There was very little difference between blacks and whites and between CONUS and Korea on the question of whites and non-whites going together to the Enlisted, NCO, and Officers Clubs (Table 21).

Quality of Race Relations in Korea

Two questions were asked about the general quality of race relations in the Army and one question focused on racial tension in the respondent's company. On all three, the responses from soldiers in Korea was more negative than those in CONUS. Fewer whites and blacks in Korea say race relations are good and more of both say they are poor.

Table 22
Perceived Quality of Race Relations

Question: *Which of the following statements is closest to your opinion?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 188)	% Blacks (N = 84)	% Whites (N = 2,750)	% Blacks (N = 933)	
16	15	23	24	In general, race relations in the Army are good.
45	43	49	45	In general, race relations in the Army are fair.
39	42	28	31	In general, race relations in the Army are poor.

Similarly, fewer in Korea say race relations in the past year have been getting better and more say they have been getting worse.

Table 23
Perceived Changes in Quality of Race Relations

Statement: *Over the past year, race relations in the Army:*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites	% Blacks	% Whites	% Blacks	
(N = 187)	(N = 83)	(N = 2,720)	(N = 950)	
28	35	30	39	have been getting better.
43	42	56	49	have not changed.
29	23	14	12	have been getting worse.

The white and black response patterns are fairly similar on both questions with a slight tendency for more blacks to view things as improving and more whites to view them as getting worse. This pattern fits with the increasing feelings of reverse discrimination by whites discussed earlier.

When the question asks about racial tension in the respondent's unit, one-quarter of the whites and over 40 percent of the blacks said it was so bad it often interfered with people getting their work done (Table 24).

Table 24
Perception of Racial Tension in the Unit

Statement: *Racial tension in my company was so bad it often interfered with people getting their work done.*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites	% Blacks	% Whites	% Blacks	
(N = 160)	(N = 76)	(N = 2,532)	(N = 786)	
24	41	12	29	Strongly Agree/Agree
22	20	15	22	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
54	39	73	49	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

The differences in the Korea response pattern from that of CONUS are large and in the direction of indicating more disruptive racial tensions in Korea than in CONUS.

Since the questions in Tables 22 and 23 were also asked in Army-wide surveys in 1972 and 1974, it is possible to compare the CONUS and Korea response patterns in 1976 with the total Army patterns in 1972 and 1974. This comparison is presented in Tables 25 and 26.

Table 25
Changes in Perceptions of Army Race Relations

White Responses	Total Army		CONUS	Korea
	1972	1974	1976	1976
Race relations are good.	20%	23%	23%	16%
Race relations are fair.	55%	55%	49%	48%
Race relations are poor.	25%	22%	28%	39%
Black Responses				
Race relations are good.	10%	20%	24%	15%
Race relations are fair.	50%	52%	45%	43%
Race relations are poor.	39%	27%	31%	41%

Table 26
Changes in Perceptions of the Trend in Race Relations

White Responses	Total Army		CONUS	Korea
	1972	1974	1976	1976
Race relations are getting better.	39%	41%	30%	28%
Race relations have not changed.	36%	41%	56%	43%
Race relations are getting worse.	24%	18%	14%	29%
Black Responses				
Race relations are getting better.	42%	48%	39%	35%
Race relations have not changed.	39%	39%	49%	42%
Race relations are getting worse.	18%	11%	12%	23%

Although it is not possible to compare the 1976 Korea responses with earlier responses strictly from Korea, it is, nonetheless, of some interest to note that the 1976 response patterns in Korea are the most negative patterns of those obtained. Fewer whites and fewer blacks are saying race relations are good and more of both are saying they are poor in Korea, 1976, than in any of the other data shown. Similarly, compared with CONUS, fewer whites and blacks are saying race relations are getting better and more of both are saying they are getting worse in Korea.

The overall response patterns obtained in Korea suggest that the racial climate there is more negative and more likely to impair mission readiness than in CONUS.

Summary and Conclusions about the Racial Climate

The majority of soldiers in Korea, both black and white, do not believe that Army race relations are good, nor do they believe the situation has changed much during the preceding year. The percentages reporting these particular perceptions were larger here than in CONUS. Also, in contrast to CONUS is the fact that whites in Korea reported higher perceptions of "reverse discrimination against non-whites. There were significant differences by race in almost every perception of the racial climate. Larger percentages of blacks saw themselves to be the victims of racial discrimination but large proportions of whites did not believe that such discrimination existed. A larger proportion of whites in Korea reported reverse discrimination than they did in CONUS.

Whites and blacks are farther apart in their perceptions of the racial climate in Korea than in CONUS. Significantly more whites and blacks in Korea than in CONUS reported that racial tension in their company was "... so bad it often interfered with people getting their work done." Although this is only a perception which may or may not be supported by objective facts, it is important to note that this perception is far stronger in Korea than anywhere else.

These findings suggest the possibility of severe racial problems which are affecting the mission-readiness of units. Clearly, a strong and effective race-relations program is needed. In the following chapter is a discussion of that program in Korea.

CHAPTER III

THE CONDUCT OF UNIT RR/EO SEMINARS IN KOREA

The major element of the Army's race relations/equal opportunity program is the unit RR/EO training seminar. Army Regulation 600-42 designates the unit chain of command with responsibility for this training, and members of the chain of command are required to present the training. That regulation requires the following: following

1. Seminars on race relations and equal opportunity topics are to be held in each unit not less than once a month.
2. All personnel are expected to attend.
3. Seminars should be presented in groups of platoon size, except that introductory sessions may be conducted in larger groups.
4. The training will be conducted during prime training time.
5. A member of the unit chain of command will lead the seminars.
6. Graduates of DRRI and Discussion Leader Schools may assist the chain of command by providing technical expertise.
7. Topics are provided by AR 600-42, however, scheduling is at the discretion of the commander and subsequent topics may be selected to meet unit needs.

In this chapter, survey findings about how the seminars are being implemented in Korea are presented. The specific findings are organized under the following headings:

Frequency of Training;
Attendance;
Topic Selection;
Instructors;
Other Seminar Characteristics.

Attitudes toward and perceptions about the importance and usefulness of the RR/EO seminar program are presented in the next chapter.

CHAPTER III

THE CONDUCT OF UNIT RR/EO SEMINARS IN KOREA

The major element of the Army's race relations/equal opportunity program is the unit RR/EO training seminar. Army Regulation 600-42 designates the unit chain of command with responsibility for this training, and members of the chain of command are required to present the training. That regulation requires the following: following

1. Seminars on race relations and equal opportunity topics are to be held in each unit not less than once a month.
2. All personnel are expected to attend.
3. Seminars should be presented in groups of platoon size, except that introductory sessions may be conducted in larger groups.
4. The training will be conducted during prime training time.
5. A member of the unit chain of command will lead the seminars.
6. Graduates of DRRI and Discussion Leader Schools may assist the chain of command by providing technical expertise.
7. Topics are provided by AR 600-42, however, scheduling is at the discretion of the commander and subsequent topics may be selected to meet unit needs.

In this chapter, survey findings about how the seminars are being implemented in Korea are presented. The specific findings are organized under the following headings:

Frequency of Training;
Attendance;
Topic Selection;
Instructors;
Other Seminar Characteristics.

Attitudes toward and perceptions about the importance and usefulness of the RR/EO seminar program are presented in the next chapter.

Frequency of Training

Forty-six percent of all respondents in Korea compared with 60 percent of all respondents in CONUS reported that unit seminars were being held at least once a month (Table 27). Comparing the response distribution of Korea with CONUS, one would conclude that seminars occur less frequently in Korea than in CONUS. Twenty-eight percent of all respondents say that they are held less than quarterly or never in Korea.

Table 27

Frequency with Which RR/EO Seminars are Held (Blacks and Whites Combined)

Question: *How often were RR/EO unit seminars usually held in your company or work unit?*

Korea (N = 196)	CONUS (N=2,827)	
46%	60%	At least once a month.
26	23	Once every two or three months.
28	17	Less than quarterly or never.
100%	100%	

In spite of the fact that it appears that seminars are held less frequently in Korea than in CONUS when the question is asked about how long ago the respondent personally attended a seminar, the Korea-CONUS difference disappears (Table 28).

Table 28

Time Since Attending Last Seminar (Blacks and Whites Combined)

Question: *How long ago did you last attend a unit RR/EO seminar in your unit?*

Korea (N=214)	CONUS (N=3,090)	
36%	38%	Less than 1 month ago.
28	24	1 - 2 months ago.
17	19	3 - 6 months ago.
6	10	7 months or longer.
13	9	Never in this unit
100%	100%	

This apparent contradiction could be explained if it were true that while seminars were held more frequently in CONUS, attendance was, in fact, less mandatory. In any case, about 60 percent in both locations are saying that they have attended a seminar within the last two months.

Topic Selection

Respondents were given a list of 19 seminar topics and asked if each of these topics had been covered in a seminar in the past 12 months. The overall response pattern was similar to that in CONUS. The five most frequently covered topics in Korea were:

- Unit RR/EO Policy
- Prejudice
- Personal Racism
- Stereotypes
- Interracial Communications.

The five least frequently covered topics in Korea were:

- Affirmative Actions Plan
- Causes and Effects of White Backlash
- DOD RR/EO Policy
- Issues of National Concern
- Multi-Racial, Multi-Ethnic Nature of America.

Four out of five of both the most and least covered topics were the same in both Korea and CONUS. Table 29 compares the responses in Korea and CONUS for all 19 topics.

Table 29
Seminar Topics

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Percent Reporting Topic Covered in Previous 12 Months</u>	
	<u>Korea</u>	<u>CONUS</u>
Introduction to Army Racial Awareness Program	49%	46%
Department of Defense RR/EO Policy	29	25
Army RR/EO Policy	60	48
Unit RR/EO Policy	74	51
Personal Racism	68	63
Institutional Racism	47	50
Stereotypes	62	52
Prejudice	70	71
Interracial Communications	61	57
Understanding Minorities' Lifestyle	49	53
The Multi-Racial, Multi-Ethnic Nature of America	35	39
Minority Contributions to American Life	41	47
Causes and Effects of White Backlash	22	27
Issues of National Concern	30	37
Irritants to Effective Relations in Your Unit	44	37
Affirmative Actions Plan	21	22
Ways of Reducing Racial Tension in Your Unit	59	49
Off-Post Racial Discrimination	54	38
Army Channels for Discrimination Complaints	57	43

Instructors

Responses to a question about who led the seminars produced the result that 80 percent were led by someone from the unit chain of command. Table 30 compares Korea and CONUS on the responses to this question.

Table 30
Instructors
(Black and White Responses Combined)

Question: *Are the unit RR/EO seminars in your company or work unit led by:*

Korea (N=173)	CONUS (N=3,006)	
80%	83%	Personnel from the unit chain of command.
8	8	A unit member.
12	9	Personnel not in unit.
100%	100%	

Other Seminar Characteristics

Respondents tended to agree that seminars are held during duty hours and during prime training time. Seminars are generally held in classrooms and dayrooms but sometimes in work areas, theaters, and dining facilities. The average number of people attending a seminar appears to be about 50 which is somewhat larger than the number reported in CONUS where the average was closer to 30. Seminars tend to run about one to two hours in length. In all of these characteristics, except for number attending seminars, there were no discernible differences in the response patterns for CONUS and Korea.

Summary

The average unit RR/EO seminar in Korea is held during prime duty hours for groups averaging 50 members, or roughly platoon-sized seminars. The seminar is conducted by a member of the chain of command and the seminar topic generally concerns some aspect of personal racism. Seminars last an average of two hours. More than half of all soldiers reported that the seminars were held in their unit once every two or three months, while more than one quarter reported that the seminars were held less often than quarterly or never.

Slightly more than half of these same soldiers, however, reported having attended a seminar within the two months prior to this survey. When these reports are compared with those of soldiers in CONUS it seems that in Korea RR/EO unit seminars are held less frequently but that a slightly larger percentage of unit members attend the training when it is held.

CHAPTER IV

CURRENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE RR/EO PROGRAM

In this chapter, the findings about the attitudes toward and perceptions of the RR/EO program in general, and the unit training program in particular, are examined.

Attitudes about the RR/EO Program

A three-item scale measured perceptions of the Army's commitment to the principle of equal opportunity⁵ The scores on this scale are shown in Table 31.

Table 31

Perceptions of the Army's Commitment to the Principle of Equal Opportunity

(The higher the score, the stronger the perception that the Army is committed to equal opportunity. Range of scores is from 3 to 15.)

	Korea			CONUS		
	N	\bar{X}	s	N	\bar{X}	s
Blacks	86	8.3	2.5	932	8.8	2.3
Whites	189	9.4	2.2	2,755	9.9	2.2
<i>Black-white differences in Korea</i>				<i>z = -3.5</i>	<i>p < .01</i>	
<i>Black differences Korea/CONUS</i>				<i>z = -3.3</i>	<i>p < .01</i>	
<i>White differences Korea/CONUS</i>				<i>z = -2.6</i>	<i>p < .05</i>	

Both blacks and whites are less convinced in Korea than in CONUS that the Army is so committed. Also, blacks in Korea are significantly less convinced than whites. These data speak to the lack of complete credibility of the Army in this area.

Related to the above perceptions are the data shown in Table 32 which concern the perceived motivations of whites in the Army. Only a small minority of whites say

⁵See Robert L. Hiatt, Marcia A. Gilbert, Dale K. Brown, *op. cit.*, 1976.

Table 32

Perceived Desire for Racial Equality by Whites

Statement: *Most whites in the Army don't want racial minorities to be treated equally.*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 161)	% Blacks (N = 76)	% Whites (N=2,354)	% Blacks (N = 787)	
9	51	12	49	Strongly Agree/Agree
22	40	23	33	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
58	9	65	18	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

they are against equal treatment. However, about half of all blacks are saying they believe whites do not want racial minorities to be treated equally. The visibility and publicity accorded the equal opportunity program notwithstanding, at least half of the blacks are questioning the basic motivation of whites in this area. This perception may help account for why such a substantial number of blacks question the sincerity of the Army's professed commitment to equal opportunity.

A related question concerns the perception of the enforcement of RR/EO policies. In Table 33 are shown the response patterns relating to this perception.

Table 33

Perception of Enforcement of RR/EO Policies

Statement: *Most NCO's usually see to it that RR/EO policies and regulations are enforced.*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 160)	% Blacks (N = 76)	% Whites (N=2,349)	% Blacks (N = 785)	
41	24	44	29	Strongly Agree/Agree
22	20	28	24	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
37	57	28	47	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Statement: *Most officers usually see to it that RR/EO policies and regulations are enforced.*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 161)	% Blacks (N = 75)	% Whites (N=2,352)	% Blacks (N = 787)	
45	36	49	34	Strongly Agree/Agree
35	25	34	35	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
19	39	17	31	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Whites are more likely than blacks to feel that policies are enforced; however, even for whites, fewer than half report that RR/EO policies and regulations are enforced by NCO's. Less than a majority of all personnel think that Army leadership enforces RR/EO regulations.

When officers are not perceived as enforcing RR/EO policies and regulations, the question arises as to whether the program is perceived as being supported by commanders. Table 34 examines this question. Whites consistently see more positive attitudes of top command levels toward RR/EO programs than do blacks. With respect to command support, somewhat more whites and somewhat fewer blacks than in CONUS perceived that the RR/EO program received a great deal of command support.

Table 34
Perceptions of Attitudes of Commanders

Statement: *The people at the top command levels honestly believe that race relations programs are a good thing.*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 191)	% Blacks (N = 88)	% Whites (N = 2,775)	% Blacks (N = 785)	
55	43	57	49	Strongly Agree/Agree
30	33	30	33	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
15	24	13	18	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Question: *How much command support does the Race Relations/Equal Opportunity (RR/EO) program receive at this post?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 186)	% Blacks (N = 84)	% Whites (N = 2,694)	% Blacks (N = 920)	
50	21	44	27	A great deal
41	62	48	57	Some
9	17	8	16	No command support

Another question related to the credibility and perceived commitment of the Army to RR/EO programs is presented in Table 35. Here again is a large difference between CONUS and Korea. In Korea, nearly half of both whites and blacks concur that "RR/EO programs on this post are mostly just for show." These are larger than the comparable responses in CONUS. It would appear that the programs do not have a high degree of credibility in Korea for either race.

Table 35
Seriousness of the RR/EO Program

Statement: *RR/EO programs on this post are mostly just for show.*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 161)	% Blacks (N = 76)	% Whites (N = 2,350)	% Blacks (N = 787)	
42	45	39	36	Strongly Agree/Agree
40	34	33	33	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
18	21	28	31	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Finally, questions were asked about the necessity of the Army's RR/EO programs and about their potential benefits.

Table 36
Perceptions of the Necessity of the Army's RR/EO Programs

Statement: *Most of the Army's RR/EO programs are unnecessary.*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 159)	% Blacks (N = 76)	% Whites (N = 2,330)	% Blacks (N = 776)	
36	24	38	23	Strongly Agree/Agree
34	25	32	29	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
30	51	30	48	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Despite the fact that whites in particular have expressed fairly negative feelings about RR/EO programs, only 36 percent were willing to say that they were unnecessary. It is of interest to note that a quarter of the blacks also said they were unnecessary. Half of the blacks and nearly a third of the whites are saying they definitely are necessary. This finding coupled with the findings in Table 37, below, which indicate that at least half the blacks and over 40 percent of the whites are saying that everybody in the Army will benefit from RR/EO programs in the long run tends to suggest that there is definitely a perceived need for RR/EO programs on the part of a substantial part of the Army personnel, both black and white.

Table 37

Perceptions of Potential Benefits of the RR/EO Program

Statement: *In the long run, everybody in the Army will benefit from race relations and equal opportunity programs.*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 161)	% Blacks (N = 76)	% Whites (N = 2,349)	% Blacks (N = 774)	
42	53	40	58	Strongly Agree/Agree
30	36	33	28	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
29	12	27	13	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Attitudes and Perceptions about RR/EO Training

The Racial Awareness Program operates within the broader context of the Race Relations and Equal Opportunity Program. This broader context was described above and it was noted that there are a diversity of views about the value of the RR/EO program in general. However, there is a substantial number of persons of all races who view the RR/EO

program negatively. In this section, attitudes that relate more specifically to the race relations training program in the units will be examined.

program negatively. In this section, attitudes that relate more specifically to the race relations training program in the units will be examined.

A number of questions were asked about the nature and value of RR/EO training. In Table 38 are responses to a question about how important such training is compared to all the different kinds of training the Army conducts. Not surprisingly, three-fourths of the

Table 38
Perceptions of Importance of RR/EO Training

Question: *Compared to all the different kinds of training the Army conducts, how important do you think race relations training is?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 191)	% Blacks (N = 88)	% Whites (N = 2,765)	% Blacks (N = 943)	
54	75	51	79	Extremely Important/Important
46	25	49	21	Not Very Important/Not Important At All

blacks saw it as important. What may be surprising to some is that half of the whites also saw it as important despite the fact, as will be seen in tables below, that they did not particularly like the training. The patterns for Korea and CONUS were quite similar. The white response is particularly interesting in that in several other questions whites had the opportunity to respond negatively about the training and for the most part did; but, here, when asked about its importance, gave a response which could be interpreted as indicating a perceived need for the training.

In Table 39, responses to the question of whether the seminars increased one's interest in improving race relations are examined. In Korea, blacks gave more positive responses than whites, nearly 70 percent of whom said the seminars did not have that effect. Both blacks and whites in CONUS gave more positive responses than did blacks and whites in Korea. From the responses to this question, one would tend to conclude that the seminars

are succeeding on this dimension much better with blacks than with whites and much better in CONUS than in Korea.

Table 39

**Perception of RR/EO Seminars' Effect on Increasing
Interest in Improving Race Relations**

Question: *Did the seminar(s) you attended increase your interest
in improving race relations?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 121)	% Blacks (N = 60)	% Whites (N=2,042)	% Blacks (N = 709)	
31	57	42	64	Yes, A Lot/Yes, Somewhat
69	43	57	36	No, Not At All/It Decreased My Interest

In Tables 40 and 41 are shown the responses to two related questions about the helpfulness of the seminars. The patterns are quite similar. About two-thirds of the blacks say they are helpful compared with about one-half of the whites. The responses in Korea tend to be more negative than those in CONUS. One overall pattern that appears to be emerging is that the white population tends to be split down the middle on questions relating to the value of RR/EO training while the black population preponderantly favors it.

Table 40

**Perceptions of the Effect of Unit RR/EO Seminars in
Improving Race Relations**

Question: *Have seminars helped you know how you can work to
improve race relations in your unit?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 121)	% Blacks (N = 60)	% Whites (N=2,044)	% Blacks (N = 708)	
52	63	53	70	A Great Deal/Somewhat
49	37	47	30	Not At All

Table 41

**Perceptions of RR/EO Seminars' Effectiveness in Improving
Unit Interracial Communications**

Question: *In your opinion, did unit RR/EO seminars help to improve communications between soldiers of different races in your unit?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 120)	% Blacks (N = 59)	% Whites (N=2,036)	% Blacks (N = 709)	
48	66	52	66	A Lot/Somewhat
52	34	48	34	Not At All

In Table 42 responses to an overall, general question about the value of race relations training for reducing racial tensions in the Army are shown. One sees again the same pattern mentioned above. Blacks see it as more effective than whites and the white population is fairly evenly divided on the question. The white response in Korea is little different from the white response in CONUS. The black response in Korea is, however, considerably more negative about the effectiveness of the training than it was in CONUS.

Table 42

Effectiveness of Training in Reducing Racial Tensions

Question: *In general, what is your opinion about the value of race relations training for reducing racial tensions in the Army?*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 192)	% Blacks (N = 88)	% Whites (N=2,766)	% Blacks (N = 940)	
5	16	5	20	Very Effective
49	47	42	52	Somewhat Effective
46	37	53	28	Not Effective At All

Finally, the question was asked whether race relations seminars are a waste of time (Table 43). A pattern which has by now become familiar emerges. Whites are fairly evenly distributed between the agree and disagree categories, whereas the majority of blacks believe they are not a waste of time. Substantially more blacks in Korea than in CONUS are either reserving judgment or are not convinced that they are not a waste of time.

Table 43
Perceptions of the Usefulness of Race Relations Seminars

Statement: *Race relations seminars are a waste of time.*

Korea		CONUS		
% Whites (N = 160)	% Blacks (N = 76)	% Whites (N = 2,350)	% Blacks (N = 786)	
38	20	39	19	Strongly Agree/Agree
29	36	27	23	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
34	45	34	58	Disagree/Strongly Disagree

Summary

The credibility of the Army's commitment to the principle of equal opportunity is questioned by more blacks and whites in Korea than in CONUS. Over half of the blacks in Korea believe that whites do not favor equality of treatment. The tendency for both blacks and whites to perceive that NCO's and officers do not enforce RR/EO policies and regulations is slightly stronger in Korea than in CONUS, stronger for blacks than for whites, and stronger as applied to NCO's than to officers. The majority of both blacks and whites in Korea believe that RR/EO programs "on this post are mostly for show." In short, RR/EO programs in Korea are not perceived as very credible.

With respect to RR/EO training specifically, more than three-quarters of the blacks and more than half of the whites said it was important compared with all other kinds

of training. The seminars were fairly successful in increasing blacks' interest in improving race relations but not successful in increasing the interest of whites. Somewhat surprisingly, in view of the above finding, more than half of both whites and blacks agreed that the seminars helped them know how they could work to improve race relations in their unit and nearly the same was true with respect to improving communication between soldiers of different races in their unit. On the general question of how effective race relations training is for reducing tensions in the Army, whites split fairly evenly between seeing it as not effective at all and at least somewhat effective. The preponderance of blacks see it as at least somewhat effective.

Compared with CONUS, RR/EO programs in Korea appear to be seen as less credible. The training program was seen as somewhat less effective in achieving its objectives than it was in CONUS, although the differences tended to be fairly small.

CHAPTER V

THE SECOND SURVEY THREE MONTHS LATER

The original research design of the total study called for a Time 1/Time 2 administration of the survey instrument with a period of time intervening to permit assessing the impact of particular training modules which occurred after the Time 1 administration. As the study developed, it became evident that the original design was inadvisable and it was modified accordingly. Because of practical exigencies of different time schedules and programs in existence, the design was modified differently in CONUS, USAREUR, and Korea, creating in essence three different partially overlapping studies.

There are a number of problems with the administration of the second survey which make the results difficult to interpret. In retrospect, it appears that it would have been better either to have cancelled the second survey or substantially extended the intervening time interval. However, by the time this became evident from the results of the first administration, the machinery and schedule for accomplishing the second survey were already in gear. It is unfortunate, therefore, that although the second administration was done, very little of value can be learned from it.

There were a number of problems with the second survey. These included:

1. insufficient intervening time interval;
2. inability to accurately describe the training occurring in the intervening time;
3. inability to supplement second administration surveys with interviews and on-site observations.⁶
4. an inexplicably lower number of whites in the second survey sample than in the first.

⁶The sampling and survey administration was conducted by personnel with the Army Research Institute Field Office in Seoul, Korea, under instructions provided by HSR personnel. HSR personnel were not in Korea for the second administration.

For these reasons, it was decided to mention in passing the results obtained but not to present them in detail or make them a prominent part of the report.

In general, the responses to questions on social climate reflected more favorable climate on the second administration, but the differences on individual items were not statistically significant.

There was an increase between Administration 1 and 2 in number of persons reporting that RR/EO seminars were held at least monthly but there was no corresponding increase in the number reporting they had *attended* a seminar less than two months ago.

In general, there were no differences in attitudes toward the RR/EO program in general, or the training program in particular.

Overall, it must be concluded that the original research design involving the second administration was inappropriate, there were difficulties in its implementation, and that little, if any, information of value resulted from it.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

As part of an Army-wide evaluation of the unit race relations/equal opportunity education and training program, survey data were collected in CONUS, USAREUR and Korea. The findings were reported in three separate reports and this particular report focuses on Korea.

The survey questionnaire dealt with perceptions of, and attitudes toward, the race relations/equal opportunity program as well as with the racial climate in Korea. The questionnaire was administered to a sample of troops drawn from a division-sized unit in Korea. It was administered twice to personnel from the same units in July and in October 1976. Data from the July survey were compared with those from the CONUS survey. Responses from the first and second surveys in Korea were compared to identify possible changes across time.

In general, for almost every question asked, the differences between the responses of whites and blacks were statistically significant. The differences reflected the overall perception by blacks that non-whites were the victims of discrimination and by whites that there was no discrimination or that minorities were favored by it.

An important aspect of these findings is that many whites perceive that whites are being discriminated against—so-called “reverse discrimination.” Surveys conducted since 1972 have tended to show a gradual increase in the proportion of whites expressing this view. Increasingly, whites are perceiving that equal opportunity programs work to the disadvantage of whites.

The survey results indicate that the racial climate in Korea is less positive than the racial climate in CONUS. Contrasted with CONUS the data suggested that in Korea:

- blacks perceived higher levels of discrimination toward non-whites;
- whites reported higher feelings of reverse racism;

- both races reported high levels of racial tension in their units;
- whites perceived themselves to be the victims of more harassment by non-whites.

One interesting aspect of the climate data from Korea is the frequency of racially derogatory verbal behavior. Despite the apparent relatively high levels of racial tension, frequency of derogatory verbal behavior was quite low. One hypothesis advanced to explain this apparent anomaly was that people of both races saw the racial situation as tenuous and only awaiting a triggering event before deteriorating even further; to avoid precipitating this deterioration, people may have avoided using inflammatory verbal behavior. Another hypothesis is that the policy against racial slurs or epithets was being respected.

The existence of the large non-white indigenous civilian population is probably an element affecting white perceptions of the racial climate in Korea. It is in the midst of this non-white population that the soldier spends much of his off-duty, off-post time. For many whites, this is their first experience in an environment in which they are a minority. This may be a factor in the expression of higher backlash feelings by whites in Korea than in CONUS.

There also appears to be a greater hardening and polarization of racial attitudes in Korea than in CONUS. Both black and white soldiers are more definite about their perceptions with smaller percentages of either group responding to items in the neutral response category for many questions.

Unit RR/EO Seminars

The RR/EO seminars appear to have minimum impact on racial climate within the Army in Korea. One of the reasons for this may have to do with the low frequency with which unit seminars are reported to be held and the subject matter of those seminars. The report of soldiers indicate that unit RR/EO seminars are held less often than monthly; the average being closer to every two months. When the seminars are held, very often the subject matter is repetitive and not related to racial problems in the unit. These problems in units

were identified as ones having to do with the treatment personnel receive with blacks perceiving that they were unfairly treated. The content of the seminars primarily was academic, centering on RR/EO programs in the Army and the unit, and on definitions of concepts and terms used with respect to race relations. Personnel have already received much of this information in training prior to coming to Korea.

Conclusions and Comments

Two overall points have implications for commanders in Korea.

- . Whites increasingly perceive that they are victims of discrimination as a result of equal opportunity or affirmative action efforts must be addressed. It will be almost impossible to successfully implement such programs without the support of the larger white majority of Army personnel. Training and education must be directed at developing an awareness among white soldiers of what the program is trying to do. More importantly, equal opportunity and affirmative action efforts must be implemented in a balanced fashion, so that the goals of equal opportunity are met, but any seeming arbitrariness about its implementation is reduced.
- . RR/EO seminars do not attend to unit racial problems. Unit RR/EO seminars more specifically must address the problems in units. Commanders and the rest of the unit chain of command must not only be sensitive to the problems in their units but must accompany that sensitivity with a willingness to confront and act upon the problems. Also, material and information appropriate for each program need to be developed using all resources available to the commander; i.e., unit RR/EO personnel, post RR/EO staff, etc.

The survey results suggest that racial tensions are higher among Army personnel in Korea than in CONUS. They also suggest that existing RR/EO unit training is not effectively achieving program objectives. That training which is done is not perceived by troops to be relevant to the race problems in their units. The overall results were interpreted by the research team as indicating that RR/EO unit training in Korea is a low priority program receiving relatively little support and having generally minimal positive impact.

APPENDIX

**CHI-SQUARE TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE OF THE
DIFFERENCES IN BLACK-WHITE AND KOREA-CONUS
RESPONSE PATTERNS**

**Chi-Square Tests of Significance of the Differences in
Black-White and Korea-CONUS Response Patterns**

Table	Whites versus Blacks Korea			Whites versus Whites Korea/CONUS			Blacks versus Blacks Korea/CONUS		
	X ²	df	p	X ²	df	p	X ²	df	p
3	127.3	2	<.001	2.3	2	ns	4.9	2	ns
4	114.6	2	<.001	0.8	2	ns	0.5	2	ns
5a	57.2	2	<.001	2.4	2	ns	0.3	2	ns
5b	117.5	2	<.001	0.3	2	ns	1.5	2	ns
6a	131.5	2	<.001	1.7	2	ns	9.6	2	ns
6b	46.5	2	<.001	1.1	2	ns	3.4	2	ns
7	86.1	2	<.001	0.5	2	ns	5.6	2	ns
8	99.8	2	<.001	5.4	2	ns	2.8	2	ns
10	44.5	2	<.001	2.3	2	ns	1.6	2	ns
11	48.1	2	<.001	5.1	2	ns	1.7	2	ns
12	20.2	2	<.001	8.6	2	<.05	0.8	2	ns
13a	4.4	2	ns	1.0	2	ns	8.2	2	<.05
13b	6.0	2	<.05	51.0	2	<.001	0.3	2	ns
14a	2.8	2	ns	2.2	2	ns	1.8	2	ns
14b	0.2	2	ns	0.1	2	<.01	0.2	2	ns
15a	23.1	2	<.001	44.3	2	<.001	0.3	2	ns
15b	2.0	2	ns	6.7	2	<.05	5.3	2	ns
16a	9.4	2	<.01	19.1	2	<.01	2.6	2	ns
16b	0.3	2	ns	1.9	2	ns	1.9	2	ns
17	5.9	2	ns	8.9	2	<.05	39.8	2	<.001
18a	45.3	2	<.001	19.7	2	<.001	2.9	2	ns
18b	5.2	2	ns	7.8	2	<.05	14.3	2	<.01

(Continued)

Table	Whites versus Blacks Korea			Whites versus Whites Korea/CONUS			Blacks versus Blacks Korea/CONUS		
	X ²	df	p	X ²	df	p	X ²	df	p
19	1.2	2	ns	2.5	2	ns	2.1	2	ns
20	2.0	2	ns	4.1	2	ns	1.3	2	ns
21	4.5	2	ns	0.8	2	ns	0.1	2	ns
22	0.3	2	ns	4.0	2	ns	4.5	2	ns
23	1.8	2	ns	27.2	2	<.001	7.1	2	<.05
24	3.3	2	ns	56.3	2	<.001	14.2	2	<.01
[Korea versus CONUS—Blacks and Whites Combined for Tables 27 and 28]									
27	22.2	2	<.001						
28	8.8	2	<.05						
30	0.8	2	ns	6.1	2	<.05	0.1	2	ns
31	9.5	2	<.01	1.5	2	ns	3.6	2	ns
32	72.8	2	<.001	0.6	2	ns	4.0	2	ns
33a	9.2	2	<.01	6.4	2	.05	0.4	2	ns
33b	10.3	2	<.01	0.7	2	ns	3.4	2	ns
34a	4.7	2	ns	1.0	2	ns	4.4	2	ns
34b	19.7	2	<.001	3.7	2	ns	1.3	2	ns
35	0.7	2	ns	8.0	2	.05	3.6	2	ns
36	10.6	2	<.05	0.31	2	ns	0.7	2	ns
37	8.2	2	<.05	0.6	2	ns	1.8	2	ns
38	11.2	2	ns	0.5	2	ns	0.8	2	ns
39	10.7	2	<.01	5.6	2	ns	1.2	2	ns
40	1.9	2	ns	0.1	2	ns	1.3	2	ns
41	5.0	2	ns	0.6	2	ns	2.1	2	ns
42	8.2	2	<.05	0.3	2	ns	2.2	2	ns
43	7.5	2	<.05	0.2	2	ns	4.3	2	ns